

MINUTES
January 17-18, 2007
Comfort Inn and Conference Center / Tumwater, WA

PRESENT: June Canty, Carol Coar, Gary Cohn, Roger Erskine, Shannon Espinoza, Kay Nelson, Dora Noble, Grant Pelesky, Martha Rice, Stephen Rushing, Ron Scutt, Dennis Sterner, Yvonne Ullas, Stacy Valentin, Jill Van Glubt and Donna Zickuhr (16)

ABSENT: Terry Bergeson, Vicki Frei and Sharon Okamoto (3)

STAFF: Esther Baker, Dr. Lin Douglas, Gina Hobbs and Nasue Nishida (4)

CALL TO ORDER (8:29 a.m.)

- Consent Agenda
 - Agenda
 - Approval of Minutes from PESB November 16-17 Meeting
 - Continuance of First Peoples' Language/Culture Certificate WAC revisions to January 18
- Announcements

Chair Van Glubt called the meeting to order and made an announcement regarding the new recording system put in place today. The microphones are very sensitive, so please table side conversations or move away from the table. The intent is for the entire recording to be posted on the PESB web site.

Chair Van Glubt reminded the audience to sign up for public comment using the salmon colored sheets on the handout table.

MOTION was made by Roger Erskine and seconded to accept the consent agenda provided the January 17-18 agenda is removed to be considered separately.

VOTE 16 yes – 0 no

MOTION passed.

Upon review of the agenda, Kay Nelson proposed moving the executive session to the end of the day on January 17 instead of January 18 so people can drive home safely.

MOTION was made by Kay Nelson and seconded to move the executive session from January 18 to January 17.

VOTE 15 yes – 0 no – 1 abstain

MOTION passed.

Chair Van Glubt highlighted topics discussed at the December Executive Committee meeting.

- Requests to meet with the Chair; these requests should be vetted through the Executive Committee
- Requested release days for the Chair to participate in events beyond the typical board activity; ten release days between now and June 2007 were approved and sub fees will be paid using pre-cert fees.
- Meeting evaluation forms; members were reminded to complete these forms using the rating system of 1-5, 1 being low and 5 being high. Please provide comments whenever possible.

Members were reminded of meeting protocol and asked to wave so they can be acknowledged and added to the speaking order. They were also reminded of the green half sheets in their folders; these quick reference guides reflect the following protocol. Minutes will also be formatted in this order.

Presentation

1. Questions on presentation
2. Public comment (if applicable)
3. Chair calls for a motion
4. Discussion on motion
5. Action

Chair Van Glubt asked members who attended the OSPI January Conference to share comments.

- Ms. Valentin liked the presentation on Pro Cert, it was very inspiring.
- Ms. Zickuhr encouraged everyone to pay attention to the collection of evidence issue that Bob Butts presented; it may impact 2-3% of our kids.
- Ms. Ullas went to three excellent breakouts; especially liking the one working with students in math.
- Ms. Coar enjoyed a presentation by Katie Haycock, presenting data on having no excuse to say we cannot do better, she was passionate about closing the achievement gap.
- Mr. Erskine shared his experience; he especially enjoyed the pre-conference focused on math.
- Chair Van Glubt also shared some of her favorite moments of the conference and thanked Dr. Arlene Hett for paying members' registration and travel using pre-cert fees.

PRESENTATION: FIRST PEOPLES' LANGUAGE / CULTURE CERTIFICATE REPORT

- Nasue Nishida, Research & Policy Analyst, PESB

Ms. Nishida gave a brief background on the FPLC pilot program. She walked through the report and proposed WAC language. As the report is still in draft form, any feedback or suggested changes related to the content of the report or proposed WAC changes can be made by staff tonight. Tomorrow, the PESB will consider approval of the final report and WAC language.

PESB members who are part of the FPLC committee include: Carol Coar, Gary Cohn, Kay Nelson and Stacey Valentin.

Ms. Nishida continued to review the draft report from beginning to end. Twenty individuals have received the certificate. Out of those 20, four of them also hold a Washington State teaching certificate.

QUESTIONS ON PRESENTATION

Members proposed changing language indicating the SBE and the PESB didn't give notice to the Tribes. They would like the report to reflect it was the WA State Legislature that didn't notify the Tribes of the change.

There was some confusion about the statement that FPLC teachers may not be employees of the district. It was suggested that administrators and other folks comment on this piece. Others raised the issue of language in the statement stating, "in most cases, the relationships between Tribes and districts are poor." Are there data in support of that statement? Tribal representatives can address that issue directly a little bit later.

Ms. Nishida said that every five years a report addressing similar elements is expected. The PESB is committed to having a member attend FPLC meetings and having this item on the agenda. The visits are not an evaluation, they are an invitation.

Members spoke in favor of the pilot program, saying how valuable it is to keep the native languages alive.

This program is exempt from the No Child Left Behind Act. Members spoke about the importance of knowing the culture. Tribes have the absolute authority to certify their teachers; the PESB should be aware of what's going on and provide recommendations. Members expressed concern about language stating Tribes are encouraged to provide written documentation; maybe they should be required to provide evidence of student achievement. The PESB would like to see the progress.

Ms. Nishida will make the suggested revisions and bring the final report back tomorrow morning.

PUBLIC COMMENT

Four people signed up for public comment. All speakers encouraged the PESB to make the pilot program permanent.

Martina Whelshula, Arrow Lakes Nation of the Confederated Colville Tribes:

Ms. Whelshula first greeted everyone in her native language. My hometown is actually in Chelan with creeks, big river and water rains; my grandmother used to say it's the singing waters. I'm really honored to be here today. I've been with the FPLC committee since the 1990's; the early conceptualization of what is it we wanted to do and the goals we have for our languages within the state. I've been in Indian education since the early 70's; I've been there and have been involved and have tried just about everything to impact positive experiences in education for Indian children; the achievement gap and just the overall sadness in Indian children and their experiences and I was one of those in school and thought I would be considered a push out in tenth grade and later got my GED and was able to go on and get my PhD in traditional knowledge. I have also worked with a language program with the Colville Tribes, worked with the elders, learned a lot, my husband and I taught in the school district kindergarten up to 12th grade, so I have personal experience in the classroom with the language and to see how powerful it is and how transforming it is and I remember teaching the language and going back to we're in a sense guests in the school district and we work with the classroom teachers and the administration and with the children under the rules and regulations of the school district and we did our best to be positive role models for the children as we teach them another language. As we were going around teaching in the classrooms, there was a speech pathologist within the school that was actually doing speech therapy to whole classrooms and he was saying that large groups of children in our schools have auditory perceptual disorder. He was following us around because he would get the class after we were done; he was fascinated because he said, "As I was sitting there listening to you working with the children in the language, I noticed that they can make sounds in your language that they can't make in English." And, he said, "They're making sounds that my trained ear couldn't pick up and I don't know why that is, maybe it's because you use multiple modalities or whatever, I don't know unless we did research on it." My husband currently teaches in Head Start so he teaches the language in the classroom and he notices that children are more animated and willing to say words and speak when it's in their language as opposed to when it's in English. Formerly, my position was Director of our Tribe's Head Start programs and what I was able to do was to take some of the certified teachers through this program. I hired on for Head Start to train my Head Start teachers and so we're working towards a modified language immersion program and kids love it. The parents are showing up in full force; talk about retention strategies, our parents come in, and community members; these are young parents that bring their babies, that bring other siblings and they come in and they come every week and they sit there and we haven't lost one parent since it started back in November. The parents are really getting excited about it and the community is excited about it and you see how powerful the language is and what it does for the families. Not only that, embedded in the language is a unique instruction or guide on how to view the world. It's a beautiful language; I always like to call ours the language of the heart. It's always about the heart; it's about your feelings, it's about the sacredness of relationships and so through the language, that's the cultural integrity that is inherent in the language is our curriculum, our teacher education because the language is what guides us in the way we interact with each other, the way we treat each other, our core traditional values of respect, of generosity, of caring, of all of those values that we hold so dear. They're not just values; they're actually our world view. That's why as you're talking about evaluations and those kinds of things, it's very dangerous when you bring someone from a different world view to evaluate practices and procedures and to evaluate another world view from one that doesn't have any experience and understanding about one so different and that's what my PhD is in so I can tell you that the indigenous world view is almost opposite of that of the western world view. It's a very different way of doing things and so a western educated individual couldn't come into an indigenous pedagogy and be able to even really understand what's going on unless we took some time to really take them through it and it's actually experiential, you have to actually feel it and you have to learn through the culture rather than just about it. So right now, I've just taken on a new position as President of the Spokane Tribal College and in that review I see the language is actually our guide in developing an indigenous model of higher education which we're looking at all the different styles of learning for our students and I just want to say that I was able to be there when the State Board of Education adopted the WAC, it was a historic occasion, something we could be very proud of and I think, more than anything, that the WAC spoke highly about how we were able to develop that through one of our core values, which is the relationships we built with the State Board of Education. I'm sorry that I haven't had the opportunity to meet the PESB and do some work on this, but I just wanted to be here today to support the tribes and to support this WAC and to offer any support I can to the committee. Thank you.

Marsha Wynecoop, Spokane Tribe of Indians, Language Program Manager:

Talking about relationships, I think we have built some good ones with the core committee; Carol, Gary, Kay and also David, who is no longer with the board, but he was one of the key people we worked with. I think it's true that relationship building with the subcommittee really is where they began to understand where we were coming from. I think that we, the programs, and the tribes are so different from anything you've seen before and that's maybe where the questions come

in. We, as Tribal people, have the most to lose if we do not have a qualified teacher because right now, we have less than 12 fluent speakers left in our language. It's not going to get any better unless we, the people, there's only three teachers right now that teach in the classrooms, and unless they are able to produce fluent speakers, I think it will die, which several in Washington State have already ceased to exist. With good relationships with the school districts like with Gary and Port Angeles, they're really instrumental in saving the language. We now have a really good relationship; a few years ago we did not, it was an every day fight to keep the language in there. Now we have a really good Superintendent who is willing to work with us and if there's any problem, there hasn't been, but if there was any problem with the teacher in the school I know that someone would come in and talk with us about it. And also we're starting to work on history and culture curriculum with the school district and so we meet twice per month to start with on the curriculum which we'll be teaching in kindergarten through 12th grade which is going to be a long process. I think I thought it was going to be an overnight thing, but it's turning out to be years down the road before we have a full curriculum because for them to understand the tribe and the true culture, it's going to take years. Thank you again.

Jewie Davis, Colville Tribes:

Mr. Davis greeted everyone in his native language. My English name is Milton Davis, but everyone knows me as Jewie, that's my nick name. I work for the Colville Tribes Language Program. I am of the Chief Joseph band and part of the Colville Tribes; it's made up of 12 different tribes. To me the importance of this pilot program is very important, not only to our children, but for the generations to come. It also affects other children in our school; they learn more about who we are, where we come from, our lifestyles and the things we do in our living, how we've survived. An example is that we take our kids out during the school year, we take them root digging, get huckleberries, make baskets and drums and they learn our identity and who we are. Our language, to us it's very sacred because it was given to us by our creator and that's what sets us apart from other tribes, other people. It's very hard to explain to a different society for me because our language is descriptive in so many ways; to us it is alive, it has its own spirit. As you learn your language, you kind of learn and come to realize that the English language...it's like it's a dead language. In our native language there is no cussing, there is no lying, it's just simple, it comes from the heart, like was said earlier. I can only speak on behalf of the part of the language program I work with, we are of the Chief Joseph band, originally from Northeastern Oregon, and we got placed on the Colville reservation. We have, from our band, five fluent speakers left. I live with my grandmother, she raised me and I learn all I can, not only at work but at home and in our long house. To me our long house is what I'm about, more so than anything. I'm just here to support the permanency of this pilot program because it is for our children and the generations to come.

Karen Condon, Okanogan Wenatchee Band of the Confederated Colville Tribes:

Ms. Condon greeted the audience in her native language. My name is Karen Condon and I'm the program manager at the Colville Tribes and I am also a member of the FPLC and I've been given the responsibility of writing the final report for the Colville Tribes. Just to clear up a couple of things, somebody had asked whether or not Yakima was involved in the pilot project; they were. Yakima also is a signer to the MOA that was originally signed in May in Omak last year. I don't know why they did not submit the report; that's up to Yakima whether or not they wanted to do that. Just a couple of things; I too, like the other three that spoke encourage you to make permanent the First Peoples' Language/Culture Certification Program. I wanted to provide you with a little bit of background. In 1879, the federal government clearly supported Americanizing Indians throughout the United States. In 1978, they opened the first federal government learning school and at those schools, it was the goal to Americanize all the Indian children. Ever since then, Tribes have been working to reverse that assimilation. That is clearly evident with what we're trying to do here. Tribes have been really pushing to gain acceptance by the larger society to become recognized as first rate citizens. The language programs are an example of how we're trying to turn those assimilation programs around. Revitalization programs that are in place in the language programs and the teacher certification programs that we have in place are prime examples of what we're trying to do in terms of providing a first rate education to our children. Jewie, who just spoke, is a prime example of somebody who is a certified teacher. He has yet to be certified by the state; that's not because he's not qualified, that's because the paperwork has yet to be submitted. We do have a number of teachers who are waiting for certification through the Colville Tribe; currently we only have one and that's Rita Condon, and she's working at Omak Middle School. We have a really good working relationship with Omak Middle School. If you have an opportunity to go look at the report, you'll notice that we have strained relationships with a lot of the local school districts that we work with. There are currently 8-9 local school districts that are on or adjacent to the Colville reservation and then there's one private school. We're trying really hard to work and form better relationships with the school districts. I know that Gary said there were questions with regard to the expiration of the certificate. When we met with the joint committee last time, we were all in agreement that the certification would not expire, we are so...it's in our best interest to provide the best highly qualified teachers that we can for our children. When I say our children, we also refer to non-Indian children who are in the school districts that we have access to. We realize, like a lot of people in the room realize, that not only do we impact Indian children, but we positively impact non-Indian children when we're given the opportunity to teach in those schools. So, we

do know that we do have a positive impact on all children and that's why I say "our children". I'm going to wrap up and say that I thank you for having the opportunity to speak and I encourage you to consider making permanent the FPLC program. Thank you.

QUESTIONS FOR THE PANEL

Members asked about the strained relationships with the school districts. Some points of contention include instances of racial tension, school administrations who may not be receptive, and money. Members were appreciative of the heartfelt comments and the amount of work that went into this program.

PRESENTATION: ADOPTION OF RECOMMENDATIONS FOR ESD TEACHER PROFESSIONAL CERTIFICATE PROGRAM CRITERIA

- Dr. Lin Douglas, Interim Executive Director, PESB

Dr. Douglas provided a brief background on the teacher pro cert program criteria. Senate Bill 5983, passed by the 2005 Legislature, charged the board with providing maximum choice for applicants, promoting portability among programs, and promoting maximum efficiency for teachers to attain professional certification. As part of this charge, there were several provisions, including one which charged the board to "provide criteria for the approval of educational service districts, beginning no later than August 31, 2007, to offer programs leading to professional certification."

Dr. Douglas shared the process by which these criteria were developed and the recommended WAC language needed to meet this legislative charge. The following activities occurred to develop recommendations:

- Meetings with ESD staff development personnel.
- Creation of a work group that included representation from the PESB, ESDs, OSPI, and WACTE.
- Development of draft WAC language that was reviewed by OSPI, ESDs, and WACTE.
- Presentation of draft WAC language to WACTE members.
- Development of final WAC language by the work group based upon feedback

QUESTIONS ON PRESENTATION

Members asked clarifying questions about some of the proposed WAC changes. They were also curious about the fee structure that will be used for this program. The fee structure hasn't been determined yet, but will after the board takes action. The evaluation and review that will take place in this program is similar to what college and universities are currently doing.

Dr. Douglas reminded everyone that all site visit reports are posted on the PESB web site at www.pesb.wa.gov. The goal is to have transparency around all of these programs.

PUBLIC COMMENT

Dan Bishop, Washington Association of Colleges for Teacher Education (WACTE):

My name is Dan Bishop; I'm the Director of Professional Development at the School of Education at Seattle Pacific University. One of my former roles there as a faculty member was as the program administrator of the teacher professional certification program. Having said that, I come to you on behalf of both the committee that worked on this and WACTE. I do want to affirm what Lin has said by way of process. I was a member of that group. I also want to express thanks to Lin and her facilitation skills in that process, as well as my colleagues at the ESD and OSPI. The members of that committee worked in a very collaborative way and I'm very pleased and proud to be a part process. I wouldn't expect any other behavior other than supportive would come out that, but as Roger mentioned, there's always a tension when it comes to work that's being done and legislation that comes in to describe that work that's been typically part of higher education and now is potentially out in entities that don't have that perfected but maybe to deliver that same work in an effective way. Institutions of higher education have those same concerns as well. The unintended consequence of opening this program up to ESDs could potentially be that you would undermine the capacity of universities to offer the same program, thereby in an attempt to legislate access; ESDs could actually reduce access because the programs at the institutions of higher education would say we can't really do this. Having said that, one of the things that was very powerful in the work with the ESD personnel was that, as Lin indicated, there really was a higher interest in continuing the collegiate work with partnerships that already exist between institutions of higher education and

ESDs. That, I fully expect, will be continued, but this language does, in fact, open up the opportunity for ESDs to venture out on their own and implement a program. As Lin also indicated in our conversations with ESD Superintendents and Assistant Superintendents, nobody is really in a hurry to jump right into that. But, given a potential need and by that potential access limitations to our teachers to programs, this provides an opportunity where institutions of higher education may not be able to serve those, or there is a limited choice in those opportunities. I do want to say thanks to Lin for her facilitation, Mary Jo Larsen from OSPI, very knowledgeable and skillful in both her willingness and her capacity to work with all the entities involved knowing their office too has responsibilities for oversight and evaluation as well. That concludes my comments, thank you very much.

Jeanne Harmon, Center for Strengthening the Teaching Profession (CSTP):

I was before you at the last meeting to talk about the new teacher project and the work we're doing in teacher induction with funding from the Allen and the Gates foundations and in cooperation with the OSPI; Sue Anderson and I were here last time. One of the things we didn't talk about at that point was professional certification, but there are...we work directly with two ESDs, 113 and 105 which are the two places in the state where there is a problem with access to professional certification; one has very little access at all and the other one only has access only if you wish to participate in a pretty expensive master's program. So, those are two places that, with the CSTP's help, are going, in fact, to begin to explore now that the WACs are settled. We will, in fact, begin to work in those two places to provide access to a high quality professional certification program for the teachers in those areas and I'm hoping to convince those two ESDs that the model we've been using to prepare National Board Certified teachers which is using NBCTs as the people who can facilitate and meet those groups will in fact be the model that they use. I don't know how all nine ESDs jump in but I do know we've already had conversations with two and I think Yakima and the Southwest corner of the state are two places we'll be looking at this very, very soon. So, thank you for settling on WAC so we can move forward.

CHAIR CALLS FOR A MOTION

MOTION was made by Grant Pelesky and seconded to adopt the proposed WAC language.

DISCUSSION ON THE MOTION

Dr. Douglas verified that the WACs have been reviewed by OSPI as far as implementation and process. Members expressed concern about adding more programs in the state and its effect on the quality of such programs. Other members spoke in favor of the motion while expressing concern over professional growth and how the state should be figuring out ways to integrate this; the districts have a major responsibility to facilitate this growth.

VOTE 13 yes – 0 no – 3 abstain

MOTION passed.

PRESENTATION: ADOPTION OF RECOMMENDATIONS FOR PRINCIPAL ALTERNATIVE ROUTE PILOT PROGRAM

- Dr. Lin Douglas, Interim Executive Director, PESB
- Dennis Connors, Program Director, Gonzaga University

Dr. Douglas provided some background on the pilot program and the WAC language.

1. July 2005, the PESB authorized a RFP to pilot an alternative route to principal certification.
2. September 2005, the RFP was issued.
3. November 2005, representatives from six institutions met.
4. January 2006, the RFP was rescinded in order to allow six institutions and interested districts to develop a program without the formality of submitting a proposal.
5. Washington Mutual provided \$35,000 to support program development costs.
6. October – present, UW – Seattle, City University, Seattle University, and Gonzaga University representatives continue to meet with AWSP and district HR personnel to finalize a statewide pilot program targeted to begin June 2007.

In order to pilot an alternative route to principal certification program, WAC changes are required. The proposed WAC language authorizes the pilot and the certificate by which program participants would be employed as secondary level assistant principals.

Dr. Douglas introduced Dennis Connors, Program Director at Gonzaga. He has been extremely instrumental in keeping us focused and on task. Mr. Connors spoke about the leadership program at Gonzaga. He is clear on the core values of this program; it's an alternative model for the preparation of leaders. It's not just skill based; it's will based.

QUESTIONS ON PRESENTATION

Members inquired about program criteria and if this pilot is related just to the issue of upcoming retirements leaving a gap of qualified principals or if this will go on into the future. Discussion began by looking at the demand data in 2004 that suggested a pending crisis at the secondary level. There are qualified leaders among the teachers and ESAs who could potentially move into those positions, but for whatever reason, they don't want to or can't pursue an additional program. The initial discussion began around how to meet the demand and provide qualified people. The candidate pools for these positions tend to be very small. There's no question that tuition at universities is going up; it's increasingly difficult for people to afford the education. This venture has the potential to help fill that gap.

Questions about selection came from members and Dr. Douglas clarified that the districts nominate people, and then an interview/selection team makes the decision to select a specific person for the program. The interview/selection team would only consider those people nominated by the district.

CHAIR CALLS FOR A MOTION

MOTION was made by Roger Erskine and seconded to adopt proposed WAC language.

VOTE 16 yes – 0 no

MOTION passed.

PRESENTATION: ADOPTION OF RECOMMENDATION TO CHANGE ESA PROFESSIONAL CERTIFICATE IMPLEMENTATION DATE

- Dr. Arlene Hett, Director, Professional Education & Certification, OSPI
- Judy Smith, Program Specialist, OSPI

Currently, WAC 181-78A-509 states that by September 1, 2007, all colleges and universities offering ESA professional certificate programs must be in compliance with the new program standards. In September, the board approved performance benchmarks for school counselors, school psychologists, and school social workers. The board also accepted a recommendation to delay implementation of professional certificate programs for these ESA groups until August 31, 2008; however, no official action was taken at that time to adopt WAC language required to approve the one year delay. It is recommended that the September 1, 2007, implementation date be changed to September 1, 2008; to allow colleges and universities time to develop their professional certificate programs and get them approved.

CHAIR CALLS FOR A MOTION

MOTION was made by Stephen Rushing and seconded to adopt proposed WAC language.

DISCUSSION ON THE MOTION

Members spoke in favor of the motion and asked that there be a plan in place to inform district administrators of the professional growth team requirement.

VOTE 16 yes – 0 no

MOTION passed.

PRESENTATION: REPORT ON CENTRAL WASHINGTON UNIVERSITY PROFESSIONAL CERTIFICATE FOCUS VISIT

- Dr. Arlene Hett, Director, Professional Education & Certification, OSPI
- Mary Jo Larsen, Program Specialist, Professional Education & Certification, OSPI
- Dr. Andrea Sledge, Program Director, Professional Certification, CWU
- Dr. Connie Lambert, Associate Dean, Teacher Programs, CWU

In order to comply with the requirements of Senate Bill 5983, the Professional Education and Certification division of OSPI initiated a site review process for all teacher professional certificate programs. At the time that Central Washington University was visited, one program standard was found “unmet.” In December, OSPI staff conducted a focused site visit.

Dr. Sledge provided information about electronic portfolios and rubrics; these tools allow you to see progress and evaluate. Dr. Lambert said CWU provided instructors and facilitators within 15 school districts. CWU is dedicated to ensuring consistency of portfolios, offering training, and offering a consistent program.

QUESTIONS ON PRESENTATION

Members asked questions about the rating system and how it has evolved from acceptable and unacceptable to met, unmet and exemplary. Clarification was provided that OSPI does not make recommendations to the PESB as to whether to approve or not approve; they only present the data and the PESB makes the decision.

Members asked for clarification on the approval timeline and the impact this approval has on the program. Dr. Douglas clarified the time lines. The Legislature references a three year evaluation for teacher pro cert programs; it's not intended to be a site visit every three years.

Members asked if there was a positive impact on student learning linked to the teacher's actions. Ms. Larsen said they have made a good change; on the continuum, they have come quite far.

One member expressed concern that report content includes the judgment of the reviewer and thinks the team should provide recommendations on what the board should do and provide options. Dr. Douglas reminded the board that, at the November 2006 meeting, the board decided to accept the recommendations of the subcommittee to move the reports forward without a recommendation and to identify options for length of approval time. The board assumes the responsibility of making that recommendation based on the report.

CHAIR CALLS FOR A MOTION

MOTION was made by Dennis Sterner and seconded to grant full approval until July 2007 when the board will take action related to the site visit scheduled for May 2007.

VOTE 15 yes – 0 no – 1 abstain

MOTION passed.

PRESENTATION: SITE VISIT REPORT FOR ANTIOCH UNIVERSITY

- Dr. Arlene Hett, Director, Professional Education & Certification, OSPI
- Bob Delisle, Interim Director, Antioch University
- Ormond Smythe, Academic Dean, Antioch University
- Judy Smith, Program Specialist, Professional Education & Certification, OSPI
- Mary Jo Larsen, Program Specialist, Professional Education & Certification, OSPI

Dr. Hett introduced Dr. Corrine McGuigan, Assistant Superintendent of Professional Development at OSPI. Dr. McGuigan introduced herself to the PESB. She will be attending all PESB meetings and is dedicated to spending this next chapter of her life looking at issues that impact teachers.

Dr. Hett provided a brief background on the Antioch site visit along with two additional documents: the Pro Cert report and the Accolades and Recommendations. The report includes 26 standards met and 7 unmet.

Mr. Delisle and Mr. Smythe spoke about Antioch University's challenges and triumphs. Antioch is a small school with a small education program; enrollment fluctuates between 135 and 150. They've had financial problems this year and have lost 5 faculty members and a great deal of support staff in education. They've been very successful in recruiting students of color. The institution has taken several measures to correct the unmet standards.

Carol Coar represented the PESB on this site visit and shared her comments. She emphasized that Antioch is doing very well in meeting their diversity goals.

Ms. Larsen provided a review of the Professional Certification site visit report and highlighted reasons why each standard received its rating.

Chair Van Glubt split the decision into two different motions, one for each program: Residency Teacher and Professional Teacher certification.

QUESTIONS ON PRESENTATION

Chair Van Glubt reminded the group about the WAC language they approved at the November meeting. There are three options for program review/approval; disapproval, one year approval, and five year approval.

Mr. Delisle said Antioch has a lot of soft data; they hired someone to translate that data. This was not a major problem at the last site visit. Over time, each cohort can be compared to each other. The data gathered are cohort specific. The institution just hired a technology specialist to assist with the collection of data.

Members were curious as to whether Mr. Delisle and Mr. Smythe think the university can turn around these unmet ratings within a one year time frame. Both agreed this could be done with higher staffing levels, but not with levels as they are today.

One member mentioned coming in today feeling strongly about disapproving this for several reasons. For one, the site visit is not a surprise – Antioch could have better prepared or said they weren't ready. He observed a lot of disorganization, understaffing, under funding, and non-compliance. He feels it's difficult to find a way to allow Antioch to continue with a program. On the other hand, the state desperately needs to recruit students like Antioch is doing now. He thought a year is too much time to give them to turn this around and is in favor of a shorter period of time, or reporting back to this group sooner.

Chair Van Glubt told the board that when a site visit is conducted, there are a number of activities going on. No one person makes a recommendation for met or unmet; the decision is made as a team.

Members wanted to know whether this report is the same, better, or worse than the last report. There are more unmet ratings in this report than in the past, many of which fall in the area of assessment. The others are in the PEAB and leadership areas. Dr. Hett stated that Antioch is on an uphill swing.

Members wanted more clarity on the three options for approval; are there any other options available? Chair Van Glubt said the board could also choose to delay recommendation until a later meeting in the year.

CHAIR CALLS FOR A MOTION

MOTION was made by Dennis Sterner and seconded to grant residency teacher certificate program one year approval, with a progress report due at the July 2007 PESB meeting.

DISCUSSION ON MOTION

Members spoke in favor of the motion, commenting that they trust Antioch can make the necessary changes within the one year time frame.

VOTE 15 yes – 1 no

MOTION Passed.

MOTION was made by Dennis Sterner and seconded to disapprove the Professional Certificate program.

DISCUSSION ON MOTION

Members believe there are too many unmet standards to approve the program at this time and several spoke in favor of the motion.

VOTE 16 yes – 0 no

MOTION passed.

Stacey Valentin stresses the importance of the site visit training offered by OSPI.

PRESENTATION: ADOPTION OF RECOMMENDATIONS FOR REVISED ENDORSEMENT COMPETENCIES (EARTH SCIENCE, GENERAL MUSIC, INSTRUMENTAL MUSIC, CHORAL MUSIC, DANCE, THEATRE, VISUAL ARTS, BIOLOGY, HEALTH/FITNESS)

- Dr. Arlene Hett, Director, Professional Education & Certification, OSPI
- Dr. Lin Douglas, Interim Executive Director, PESB

The board charged the PEC division of OSPI with conducting a review of all endorsements to identify competency revisions required at this time. During the November meeting, Dr. Hett shared a timeline by which those reviews would be conducted. That timeline has since been adjusted based upon the written updates provided in your packet. A revised timeline was distributed. Dr. Hett described the review process that resulted in the revisions proposed for board consideration. Dr. Hett arranged for one member of each work group to meet with the board to discuss the competencies.

Chair Van Glubt asked about the new timeline and the ability to meet the dates so NES could meet the new testing dates. Dr. Hett said they could meet those timelines; at the same time, if the board charges PEC with new actions, that will take more time. Also, if PEC runs into problems reaching consensus, that will add time as well.

Dr. Douglas briefly walked members through the process and then they broke out into groups to discuss each competency and their recommendation for approval. Teacher candidates will be responsible for being accountable to each of these competencies and NES will need these to develop the new tests.

Dr. Douglas brought the groups back together to chart the recommendations for each competency.

Competency	Yes	No	Comments
Choral Music	XX		No caveats
General Music	XX		No caveats
Instrumental Music	XX		Editing issues; separate motion
Biology	XX		Editing issues; separate motion
Earth Science	XX		Pull for caveats. Recommendation from committee that didn't make it on the paper; title should read Earth and Space Science; separate motion.
Health/Fitness	XX		No caveats
Dance	XX		No caveats
Theatre	XX		Editing issues; separate motion
Visual Arts	XX		No caveats

QUESTIONS ON PRESENTATION

Discussion regarding the process for approving/disapproving each competency followed. Chair Van Glubt decided to accept separate motions, grouping competencies without revisions, with revisions, and those recommended for disapproval (if any).

CHAIR CALLS FOR A MOTION

MOTION was made by Roger Erskine and seconded to accept Choral Music, General Music, Dance, Visual Arts, and Health/Fitness competencies as presented.

VOTE 16 yes – 0 no

MOTION passed.

CHAIR CALLS FOR A MOTION

MOTION was made by June Canty and seconded to accept Biology and Instrumental Music competencies with required edits.

VOTE 15 yes – 0 no

MOTION passed.

QUESTIONS ON PRESENTATION

The group presenting the Earth Science competency spoke about two issues raised. One is the title; the committee would like the title to be Earth and Space Science so it's consistent with K-12 standards. This will require a change to WAC language. Also, the group asked about greater specificity of stakeholder feedback regarding content. Mary Jo Larsen came forward to clarify the process used to capture stakeholder feedback and speak to the specificity. Ms. Larsen said they didn't have sufficient time to vet that through the committee.

CHAIR CALLS FOR A MOTION

MOTION was made by Kay Nelson and seconded to disapprove the Earth Science competencies and send it back to the committee for further review and revision.

DISCUSSION ON MOTION

Several members spoke in favor of the motion. Members expressed concern over consistency of all competencies. Ms. Larsen addressed the concern and said PEC will consider consistency when reviewing all competencies. One member commented that these should not be aligned with the GLE's since those consistently change; that would prevent having to revise the actual competencies. Other members felt the timing on receiving feedback from stakeholder was an issue, due to the inclement weather and recent holidays.

VOTE 14 yes – 0 no – 1 abstain

MOTION passed.

QUESTIONS ON PRESENTATION

Members discussed the time it takes for these approvals and stressed that it shouldn't take six months. Maybe the board can give PEC some parameters before the reviews take place, rather than revising them after they've been recommended. The board should base their recommendation of certain principles that have already been established. Members recognized and thanked Dr. Hett and her staff for all the hard work they've been doing on these competencies.

CHAIR CALLS FOR A MOTION

MOTION was made by Yvonne Ullas and seconded to accept the Theatre competency with noted revisions; state standards aligned with EALR.

DISCUSSION ON MOTION

Members spoke in favor of the motion, especially about aligning the state standards with the EALR.

VOTE

15 yes – 0 no

MOTION passed.**PRESENTATION: ADOPTION OF RECOMMENDATIONS FOR REVISED SECONDARY MATH ENDORSEMENT COMPETENCIES**

- Dr. Arlene Hett, Director, Professional Education & Certification, OSPI
- Larry Lashway, Professional Education & Certification, OSPI
- Dr. Mike Gilbert, Eastern Washington University
- Robert Hodgman, Mathematics Initiative Specialist, OSPI
- Esther Baker, Math Committee Member, PESB

Given the high interest in mathematics instruction and student performance in the area of mathematics, it was determined that the full board should review the proposed revised endorsement competencies for secondary mathematics.

Mr. Lashway has been working with this committee for about two years now. He provided a brief background on the development of the math competencies that were first presented to the board at the July 2006 meeting. The competencies are well aligned with EALR and NCTM standards so they're closely aligned with the national standards. PEC is segregating the content standards from the methodology standards. One major issue that surfaced is the specificity of the standards.

His presentation was followed by review of the competencies in the teams assigned for the previous activity. Following the review, the team facilitators shared their respective recommendations.

POINT OF ORDER

Chair Van Glubt recognized a special guest who just joined the meeting and gave the floor to Nasue Nishida.

Ms. Nishida introduced Representative Deb Wallace, Chair of the House Higher Education Committee.

Representative Wallace spoke about her new role as Chair of the House Higher Education Committee. Representative Wallace spoke briefly about her background in economic development and transportation. She said the work of the PESB is very important and she wanted to thank the board in person. Representative Wallace has an open door; she keeps an education email list where information and questions can be sent (<http://www1.leg.wa.gov/house/wallace/>). She said this is a very exciting time in education; it's the Governor's number one priority; there is a workforce that knows they need more trained, educated people; and communities of people who need to be trained and educated so they have a better quality of life. Representative Wallace hopes the board realizes the importance of what they're doing. She mentioned that she was challenged in math as a child and until she had a teacher in 7th grade who turned her on to math, she didn't get it. The things the board is doing, the curriculum, and the energy that educators put forward; it's all so huge and makes such a big difference. Representative Wallace thanked the board for their time.

Chair Van Glubt asked Dr. Douglas to take the groups through the recommendation process, as in the previous agenda item.

Group	Yes	No	Comments
Group 1	XX		
Group 2		XX	Spent our time going through the response to the July board questions. Stuck on two areas.
Group 3	XX		
Group 4	XX		Yes, with a caveat on number three.

QUESTIONS ON PRESENTATION

Members expressed concern over the make-up of the review committees and that there were only two teachers actually on the committee. Mr. Lashway addressed the issue and said the intent was originally there, but due to scheduling issues

they did not receive feedback from everyone. He also mentioned the committee consulted with other practitioners from whom they received feedback.

Members said they want to see intervention strategies included in the math competencies. Some feel there is a need to send this back to the committee for further review and revision. Others feel that the time involved will delay implementation of the new endorsement competencies; some adjustments can be done quickly, others can not. The longer the approval process takes, the less time higher education institutions will have to implement the changes.

Members feel there is a huge difference between providing feedback and having an actual vote on the committee. They would like to see more practitioners on the committee reviewing math endorsement competencies.

MOTION was made by Gary Cohn and seconded to disapprove the secondary math competencies at this time and send them back to the review committee.

DISCUSSION ON MOTION

Members questioned the specifics of the motion.

Chair Van Glubt suggested there are three possible pathways for members to think about.

1. Pathway one; accept the endorsement competency as-is, possibly with a caveat, possibly without.
2. Pathway two; convene a focus group for teachers to give input.
3. Pathway three; reconvene committee and add more teachers. They would review the documents, have the discussion with teachers and decision makers on the committee; maybe specify how many teachers the board would like to have on the committee.

MOTION WITHDRAWN by Mr. Cohn.

DISCUSSION ON MOTION

Members expressed concern about the timeline and how it will impact higher education institutions. Also, some members don't think pathway 2 should be used because focus groups weren't used for the other competency work groups and the process should be consistent.

Members discussed the questions posed to PEC back in July and are concerned that they weren't addressed. Some feel the committee addressed Terry Bergeson's questions, but not the PESB's. The board specifically asked for involvement of math teachers and examples of evidences. Other competencies included 11 teachers on the committee and this included only one. Members asked if they could delay the test until 2008. Ms. Baker addressed the question and said there is a little more time before looking at delaying the WEST-E implementation, currently scheduled for September 2008.

CHAIR CALLS FOR A MOTION

MOTION was made by Roger Erskine and seconded to delay final action to the March meeting and ask OSPI staff to expedite getting input from practicing classroom teachers.

DISCUSSION ON MOTION

Mr. Erskine spoke to this motion saying there is so much time and energy around math these days and we don't want to send the wrong signal if there is a delay in this, as it may create more angst as the board moves through the process. He thinks it's important to get the feedback, and the process needs to keep going.

Members continued to discuss the number of teachers they would like to see on the committee.

AMENDMENT TO THE MOTION to include 9-12 practicing secondary teachers on the committee.

SECONDARY FRIENDLY AMENDMENT TO THE MOTION to make a broader spectrum of grade levels represented.

AMENDED MOTION was made by Roger Erskine and seconded to delay final action to March 2007 meeting and ask OSPI staff to expedite putting 9-12 teachers from a broad range of grades 6 – 12 on the committee to conduct a final evaluation of the competencies.

VOTE 14 yes – 0 no – 2 abstain

MOTION passed.

Members thanked the panel and one principal representative offered to commit teachers from her district. Mr. Lashway clarified that this is not a substantive issue; it's a process issue.

CHAIR CALLS FOR A MOTION

MOTION was made by Kay Nelson and seconded for the board to move into Executive Session for 30 minutes for the purpose of evaluating the qualifications of an applicant for employment.

VOTE 16 yes – 0 no

MOTION passed.

ADJOURN TO EXECUTIVE SESSION*

- **Jill Van Glubt, Chair**

**Under RCW 42.30.110, an executive session may be held for the purpose of receiving and evaluating complaints against public officers or employers; reviewing the qualifications of an applicant for public employment or reviewing the performance of a public employee; consultation with legal counsel regarding agency enforcement actions or actual or potential agency litigation considering the sale or acquisition of real estate; and or/reviewing professional negotiations.*

CHAIR CALLS FOR A MOTION

MOTION was made by Grant Pelesky and seconded to reopen the Executive Director search in late February with interviews in late March/early April; retaining Sheila Emery as a consultant to coordinate the search; approving the Executive Committee as the group that will interview and select the Executive Director; and approving an Executive Director salary range of \$93,000 - \$99,000.

VOTE 16 yes – 0 no

MOTION passed.

Chair adjourned at 5:37 p.m.

January 18, 2007

PRESENT: June Canty, Carol Coar, Gary Cohn, Roger Erskine, Shannon Espinoza, Kay Nelson, Dora Noble, Sharon Okamoto, Grant Pelesky, Martha Rice, Stephen Rushing, Ron Scutt, Dennis Sterner, Yvonne Ullas, Stacy Valentin, Jill Van Glubt and Donna Zickuhr (17)

ABSENT: Terry Bergeson and Vicki Frei (2)

STAFF: Esther Baker, Dr. Lin Douglas, Gina Hobbs and Nasue Nishida (4)

CALL TO ORDER (8:46 a.m.)

Late start due to technical difficulties.

- Announcements

Chair Van Glubt reminded members to complete the board meeting evaluation sheets and give them to Gina before they leave today. She also reminded members of the audience to sign the public comment sheets if they are interested in speaking to an item that's open for public comment.

- Legislative subcommittee

The board needs a Legislative committee to respond to inquiries during session. Members of this subcommittee will be required to respond to emails in a timely manner. A few members have already signed up for this committee and they are: Roger Erskine, Kay Nelson, Carol Coar and Dennis Sterner. No other members volunteered at this time.

- Subcommittee to develop recommendations related to budget/use of pre-cert funds

The Executive Committee determined that the board should look more closely, and perhaps provide more focus and direction, at the use of pre-certification fees. The board needs a couple of members to volunteer for a subcommittee that will examine the financial reports and ways in which the funds were used by the ESDs and OSPI to develop recommendations to bring forward to the board. It is envisioned that this work can occur within one to two meetings. Volunteers for this committee include: Roger Erskine, Yvonne Ullas, and Carol Coar.

- Subcommittee – Program Pre-proposal review – member selection

In November, the board adopted WACs that require institutions to submit a pre-proposal prior to developing a full proposal to seek approval for a new educator preparation program. That process involves the use of a subcommittee to review the pre-proposals in order to make a recommendation to the full board. The board needs 3 or 5 members who would like to serve on this committee. Most of this work can be conducted via e-mail review of the documents. Volunteers for this committee include: Roger Erskine, Shannon Espinoza, Dora Noble, June Canty, and Stephen Rushing

- SBE Liaison Report (written; attached)

Chair Van Glubt thanked Sheila Fox for serving as the liaison from the State Board of Education. Roger Erskine serves as the liaison from our board to the State Board. The board appreciates the time and energy that it takes for both of them to perform this role.

PRESENTATION: ADOPTION OF REPORT AND RECOMMENDATIONS FOR FIRST PEOPLE'S LANGUAGE CERTIFICATE

- Nasue Nishida, Research & Policy Analyst, PESB

Yesterday, the board reviewed the First Peoples' Language/Culture Certificate end-of-program analysis report and proposed WAC changes. Changes have been incorporated into the final report which was distributed to members this morning.

Chair Van Glubt recognized the hard work and dedication of the joint committee over the last 16 months. She thanked them for their commitment of time and thoughtful deliberation.

Ms. Nishida highlighted changes made to the report based on yesterday's discussion.

PUBLIC COMMENT

Natasha Gobin and Eliza Davis, Lushootseed Language Department, The Tulalip Tribes:

Ms. Gobin greeted everyone in her native language. Good morning, my name is Natasha Gobin, I'm a Lushootseed language teacher; this is my friend Eliza, she's also a Lushootseed language teacher. We'd like to thank you for gathering to discuss the work that the teachers do. What we're going to do is show a video our department has created to show why we support having the certification for our teachers.

Due to technical difficulties, the video was not played.

Marsha Wynecoop, Language Program Manager, Spokane Tribe:

I came here to comment that we agree. We are okay with all the changes made to the report. Yesterday I was a little nervous and I forgot to thank Nasue and Jennifer Wallace also for helping us and working on the pilot program.

Karen Condon, Colville Tribes:

Ms. Condon greeted everyone in her native language. Again, my name is Karen Condon, and I have with me Lee Adolph who's the Chairman of the Tribal Government and also Vice-Chair of the Colville Tribe Education and Employment Committee and he would like the opportunity to speak before you.

Lee Adolph, Colville Tribes:

Good morning everyone. First of all, I'd like to thank all the people who were involved with this for the past 16 months or so. I think with the language certificate program that's moving forward it's helping to standardize the school districts...I think that's the tension that we feel and can see as time progresses. I think also as we implement this there's going to be a funding source; the tribe will fund it. Also, with the curriculum, I think the state or the local school districts say they'll have the funds for it. I think that's one of the "horse shoes" we always miss out on. There's other stuff where they put money forward, you see it with the federal government; you see it with the state agencies, you see it with local government. That's one of the issues we look for and that's, when we have legislation and lobby, what we speak on behalf of and look for funding for that. A lot of the tribes put a lot of effort and time in this and we want to thank you for allowing us to do a pilot project; I think it's going to help us all. Thank you again for being here today and having the opportunity to at least give testimony for this program.

Jim Meadows, Washington Education Association (WEA): *(written testimony provided by Mr. Meadows)*

For the record, I am Jim Meadows representing the Washington Education Association. I believe previous testimony has been offered on this topic by Lucinda Young. I am here today to affirm WEA's support for the institutionalization of the First Peoples' Certification process, which:

- Honors the powerful role of language in tribal identity; anyone who has learned another language knows that language is a key for unlocking so many other things that are important;
- Helps Tribes reclaim their languages – and in doing so, rebuild connections with their rich cultures, histories and traditions;
- Is and will have a strong impact on students now and for generations to come. The impact extends far beyond Tribes to better all of Washington State

It is important to recognize the sovereign nation status of the Tribes in determining the implementation and accountability process. Our state needs to respect and appreciate the expertise, commitment and investment of the Tribes with the certification process. The ideal is for this process to be a partnership where all stakeholders share a commitment to the desired end.

In terms of specific feedback on edits made to the report, WEA supports the rewording of the certification expiration section, giving tribes the role to reaffirm that criteria are being met every five years.

We thank the PESB, especially the sub-committee that has worked with this process, for its commitment to the First Peoples' Certificate. I also want to publicly share WEA's appreciation for the leadership of our state's Tribes to make this process a reality. We will all be better for it.

Chair Van Glubt recognizes Eliza and Natasha again to see if they can play the video. The video played for a few minutes and then stopped due to technical difficulties. A link to the complete video is available on the PESB / FPLC web site at <http://www.pesb.wa.gov/FirstPeople/default.htm>.

Natasha Gobin and Eliza Davis, Lushootseed Language Department, The Tulalip Tribes:

Ms. Davis brought an extra copy of the DVD that members can view during today's lunch break. I would like to say that I'm in support of this certification and I am a teacher in the schools and I feel very honored to be able to provide my little cousin and members of the community with our heritage and our language. I think that it aids them in all areas of school and gives them a really good sense of who they are and respect. So, I feel very honored to do the work and I just wanted to share that with you, and that we are in support, and that we have the other DVD and we hope it works out.

CHAIR CALLS FOR A MOTION

MOTION was made by Yvonne Ullas and seconded to accept the revised joint report as written.

DISCUSSION ON MOTION

Several members spoke in favor of the motion and expressed appreciation to the committee. One member said there's no question concerning the value of this program and there's no problem with making the pilot program permanent. He is concerned about the practical elements of these teachers walking through the door into the public school system. He wants to know if it's a completely autonomous element or if there some give and take? PESB staff and Tribe members addressed this concern and clarified that it's a district and tribe relationship to decide whether to offer this program and teachers are there because they're invited. They follow the same rules, regulations and policies of the schools. Another board member spoke to the fact that she brought up this issue yesterday and believes it was addressed. She then spoke in favor of the motion and encouraged other members to vote in favor.

Carol Coar said it has been an honor to serve on this committee and she would ask Chair Van Glubt to allow a committee member to make the motion for WAC changes and another committee member to second the motion. Chair Van Glubt agreed.

VOTE 17 yes – 0 no

MOTION passed unanimously.

CHAIR CALLS FOR A MOTION

MOTION was made by Kay Nelson and seconded (by Carol Coar and Gary Cohn) to accept WAC changes to make the FPLC pilot program permanent.

DISCUSSION ON MOTION

Mr. Cohn spoke on behalf of the motion and the WAC changes. The board is setting policy at the state level and he would hope to see a language program in every school district where tribal languages are taught. The existence of the language programs, with other things that are done, creates an atmosphere of respect, relationship building, and develops a level of relevance for children that otherwise doesn't exist. He believes this contributes to children's ability to achieve in our schools; he's a complete supporter. He believes in most cases, the teachers are volunteers or they are paid by the Tribes. Mr. Cohn said he is committed to going anywhere he's asked to go to talk about the positive impact of this program on students, student learning and their relationships within the school; he would even go to the Legislature with anyone who wants to propose directed, specific, specialized funding to be able to keep these programs developing and maintain them over time because the pressures on school budgets are significant. Mr. Cohn asked all board members to vote in favor of this motion.

Several members spoke in favor of the motion and expressed their appreciation for members of the subcommittee who worked on this. This is an historic time for the board. It's something that will be remembered well into the future.

ROLL CALL VOTE 17 yes – 0 no

Yes: June Canty, Carol Coar, Gary Cohn, Roger Erskine, Shannon Espinoza, Kay Nelson, Dora Noble, Sharon Okamoto, Grant Pelesky, Martha Rice, Stephen Rushing, Ron Scutt, Dennis Sterner, Yvonne Ullas, Stacy Valentin, Jill Van Glubt and Donna Zickuhr

No: None

Abstained: None

Absent: Terry Bergeson and Vicki Frei

MOTION passed unanimously.

Mr. Cohn encouraged the Chair and the Executive Director to send a letter to every superintendent in the state encouraging their district to examine and consider this language program.

Ms. Nishida said Washington is now the second state (behind Montana) to make this program permanent.

PRESENTATION: ISSUES / OPTIONS RELATED TO READING PRAXIS II

- Esther Baker, Program Director, Teacher Assessments, PESB
- Jerry Deluca, Client Services Director, ETS

Ms. Baker presented information regarding the low pass rate for the Reading/Literacy endorsement PRAXIS II test and described options to address this situation. Mr. Deluca assisted with this discussion. He provided an additional handout this morning with general state data about passing scores for other states.

The 2005-06 WEST-E summary data for the Praxis II series tests used to verify content knowledge for most of the endorsements show that four tests have less than 80% pass rates. They are:

Praxis II Test	Endorsement(s)	ETS' % Match with Endorsement Competencies
English to Speakers of Other Languages (ESOL)	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Bilingual• English as a Second Language	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Not conducted• 100%
Marketing Education	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Marketing	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• 87%
Reading Specialist	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Reading/Literacy	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• 89%
Special Education: Preschool/Early Childhood	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Early Childhood Special Education	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Not conducted

Further research and study are needed before reporting information or recommending possible action on the 3 tests for ESOL, Marketing, and Special Ed Preschool/Early Childhood. However, attention is recommended on the Reading Specialist Praxis II test passing rate. The use of the test became a concern about 3-4 months after implementation of the requirement. Examinees and teacher preparation programs began expressing concern about the level at which the test is geared. The mini-study guide called, *A Test at a Glance*, states,

"The Reading Specialist test is intended primarily for persons who have advanced academic preparation and/or who are being considered for supervisory or instructional positions related to the teaching of reading instruction in grades K-12. The test is most appropriate for candidates with advance preparation (i.e., those with a master's degree or course work comparable to the training needed for a master's degree) who expect to have specialized responsibilities related to the teaching of reading at any level from kindergarten through twelfth grade. It is also appropriate for individuals who wish to be considered for supervisory or instructional positions related to the teacher of reading: those seeking positions as reading clinicians, consultants, supervisors, specialists, coordinators, or resource persons and thus intending to be responsible for more than the teaching of developmental reading in a regular classroom setting."

Members questioned the initial selection of this test years ago; was it selected out of necessity to have something without pedagogy; is that part of the consideration? Ms. Baker addressed that by saying that's a concern for the selection for all of the tests because of the RCW that states instructional methodology is not to be assessed by content knowledge exams. Mr. Deluca added that the selection was made by their predecessors so he can't speak to the exact reasons for selection; there are typically many different reasons.

The programs for the reading/literacy endorsement are not geared to the advanced or master's degree level, and, the Praxis II tests are validated based on the knowledge that the entry-level teacher should possess.

Two options exist to address the issue. They both involve gathering a group of WA educators together who are knowledgeable about reading to:

- 1) Review the current test to see if it appropriately assesses content knowledge for the reading/literacy endorsement. The group of educators could also review two other Praxis II exams that exist. They are entitled "Reading Across the Curriculum: Elementary" and "Reading Across the Curriculum: Secondary". (See attached mini-study guides.) Together the two tests could be used to assess content knowledge for the reading/literacy endorsement. A concern does exist about the presence of questions regarding instructional methodology on the tests. RCW 28A.410.220 states that instructional methodology shall not be assessed on the content knowledge exams. A strong argument can be made that the knowledge of how to teach reading is legitimate content for this endorsement. A review of the reading endorsement competencies clearly illustrates this point. The possible outcomes could involve an affirmation of the test with or without recommendation to adjust the passing score, or a rejection of the test with recommendation to conduct a validation, job relevance and standard setting study on an alternative test(s).
- 2) Review the data from the original validation study with the possibility of lowering the passing score by a standard error of measure (SEM). Mr. Deluca explained this process in the same way that he explained the standard setting of the Deaf and Hard of Hearing Praxis II test at the November meeting. Lowering the passing score involves a policy/decision regarding the effective date of the adjusted score. Oregon reviews their annual Praxis II pass rate data and makes yearly adjustments to their passing scores. For that state, the new score becomes effective at the beginning of the next test year. Nevertheless, the board has the option of adjusting the score mid-test year if desired.

Staff is requesting that the board provide direction as how to proceed given the options presented.

QUESTIONS ON PRESENTATION

Members questioned the positions held by current test takers and wondered if they meet the state's highly qualified requirements. Mr. Deluca said they see lower pass rates in instances where candidates are trying to get more endorsements to meet the No Child Left Behind requirements. Test takers would have to list their major discipline when taking the test. Ms. Ullas requested that she be provided with that information.

CHAIR CALLS FOR A MOTION

MOTION was made by Yvonne Ullas and seconded to direct staff to recruit a group of WA educators to conduct an alignment match with reading across the elementary and secondary curriculum.

DISCUSSION ON MOTION

Ms. Ullas spoke in favor of the motion. Discussion centered on logistics of students taking this test as opposed to other tests that were more aligned

One member spoke against the motion based on the cost, effort, and personnel versus the benefit that will be gained from this effort. It's a tremendous effort at a fairly significant cost for a very minimal benefit. Other members joined in their opposition to the motion; citing similar reasons.

VOTE 2 yes – 15 no

MOTION failed.

Chair Van Glubt decided to take no action instead of accepting another motion. The Reading Praxis II test will stand as-is until the new WEST-E is implemented in September 2008.

PUBLIC COMMENT

Jeanne Harmon, Center for Strengthening the Teaching Profession (CSTP):

My name is Jeanne Harmon, I'm the Director of the Center for Strengthening the Teaching Profession and I feel a little strange interrupting. I put, on your table, a flyer. You may recall last time we met, I gave you a copy of a publication called Teachers Voices. We just got the details together for this summer's writing retreat and also for an opportunity for teachers to write about leadership and to learn to speak about education as education advocates and I know you all know great teachers. So, before you left today, I wanted to put one of these flyers in front of you so you can spread the news around to others who might be interested. I would really appreciate it; the information and applications are on our web site. Thank you.

PRESENTATION: PEDAGOGY ASSESSMENT UPDATE

- Dr. Andrew Griffin, Assistant Superintendent, Higher Education & Certification, OSPI
- Dr. Chris Sordoff, Director of Field Services and Student Teaching, Washington State University
- Dr. Steve Siera, Director of Graduate Programs, St. Martin's University
- Dr. Joyce Westgard, Dean, St. Martin's University
- Kathleen Allen, Assistant Professor and Supervisor at St. Martins University
- Melissa Palmer, Student Candidate

Each teacher candidate's skills are assessed with the Performance-Based Pedagogy Assessment of Teacher Candidates Instrument. A candidate must pass the competencies identified on the assessment in order to be recommended for a certificate. If an individual does not demonstrate proficiency in a competency, the college/university may allow the student to be assessed in another manner on that competency.

Dr. Griffin provided a couple of handouts: Performance Based Pedagogy Assessment of Teacher Candidates, and Reliability and Validity Study for the Washington Performance-Based Pedagogy Assessment for Teacher Candidates. He reviewed a few sections of each report

Dr. Sordoff provided a brief history of the pedagogy assessment at Washington State University (WSU). She presented video and highlighted sections of the WSU web site. Strengths focus on academic achievement, rubrics and the impact teachers have on the students they're teaching. Some of the rubrics are similar and seem repetitive, some are challenging to observe. There needs to be more work done on making sure we're all on the same page. There are too many rubrics for consistency or meaning. It makes sense to collapse these into a smaller document. We need continued training of supervisors. WSU is trying to do this with a training video and a web site.

Dr. Westgard provided some background on the Performance Pedagogy Assessment (PPA) program at St. Martin's University, where they've got the PPA on a PPC (Personal PC). Dr. Siera also provided some highlights of the PowerPoint presentation; along with handouts for board members. Both provided an overview of the training used for these personal devices. Three supervisors completed a pilot assessment using the PPC-PPA. They reviewed feedback from pilot participants, and highlighted next steps for the program.

Ms. Allen spoke about her experience with the PPA on PPC training at St. Martin's University. Ms. Palmer was one of her student teachers and also shared some of her experiences learning to use the PPC.

QUESTIONS ON PRESENTATION

Members asked questions related to the program and web site at Washington State University and the instrument used at St. Martin's University

K-8 SUBCOMMITTEE UPDATE

- Ron Scutt, Subcommittee Chair, PESB member
- Nasue Nishida, Policy & Research Analyst, PESB

At the November 2006 board meeting Mary Jo Johnson, Director of Title II at OSPI, presented the most recent highly qualified data as they relates to the placement and preparation of middle school teachers holding an elementary

endorsement. Ron Scutt, the K-8 Subcommittee Chair, also provided a brief presentation on themes from focus groups conducted last summer.

Mr. Scutt presented an update from the K-8 subcommittee. The presentation highlighted focus groups and comments received from participants. It also answered questions asked at the November 2006 meeting. The K-8 committee will be presenting to the board at the March 2007 meeting.

Ms. Nishida spoke about the timeline and outlined the following:

- March 2007: Work sessions will take place.
- May 2007: The K-8 subcommittee will bring a recommendation to the PESB.
- July 2007: The PESB will review the revised K-8 endorsement competencies.
- September 2007: The PESB will take action on the certificate and its span.

Mr. Scutt and Ms. Nishida invited members to send any questions via email. It was also agreed that there will be room for public comment at each of the upcoming work sessions.

PRESENTATION: REVIEW OF PREVIOUS UNIVERSITY OF WASHINGTON - TACOMA AND CENTRAL WASHINGTON UNIVERSITY SITE VISIT REPORTS – GENERATE QUESTIONS FOR UPCOMING SITE VISITS

- Dr. Lin Douglas, Interim Executive Director, PESB

In November 2006, the PESB adopted a new procedure by which past site visit reports are reviewed by the PESB for the purpose of identifying any key issues or concerns to be addressed during an upcoming site visit. UW-Tacoma's site visit is scheduled for January and CWU's site visit is scheduled for May.

Dr. Douglas briefly reviewed the program approval process. She directed members to the information in the packets and reminded them they're being asked to develop specific issues or concerns to keep in mind for those upcoming site visits.

QUESTIONS ON PRESENTATION

Members who have been part of site visit teams in the past offered suggestions such as asking institutions to bring their original proposal so the team knows what they were initially approved to offer and what's expected. This is a great option for new programs, but for those that have been in existence for years, it will be difficult. In these cases, teams could view the previous site visit.

Dr. Douglas clarified that anything rated as unacceptable during the last site visit will automatically be addressed. This review session is designed for the board to identify elements of particular concern outside those automatically addressed by the site visit team. If there are no red flags, or items of particular interest to the board, we can move on.

The board identified one area of interest relating to both institutions:

- Gender & ethnicity percentages; what are they doing to recruit people of color and males in some of the content areas?

PRESENTATION: LEGISLATIVE UPDATE

- Nasue Nishida, Research & Policy Analyst, PESB

The 2007 Legislative Session began January 8, 2007. Governor Gregoire released her proposed 2007 – 09 biennial budget, which includes a larger workload and sizeable funding increases for the PESB. Most of the proposed funding to the PESB supports producing more math and science teachers by way of expanding existing alternative routes to teacher certification and developing two new means for preparing more people to teach in math and science.

Highlights from her proposed budget include:

- Expansion of the alternative routes to teaching program;
- Development of the Pipeline for Paraeducators Program – provide a conditional loan scholarship to paraeducators without a degree to seek a degree and certification in math or science;
- Development of the Retooling to Teach Math Program – provide a conditional loan scholarship to existing certificated teachers to pick up endorsements in math or science;

- Revision of the math endorsement competencies (already underway) and alignment to the WEST-E assessments;
- Creation of a new professional certificate assessment that is uniform across the state and externally administered; and
- Increase to the PESB's operating budget.

The Governor's proposed allocation to the PESB for these activities totals \$4,543,000 for 2008 and \$5,803,000 for 2009.

A couple of items the board requested aren't in the Governor's proposal and Ms. Nishida is working to get sponsorship from other Legislators who have expressed interest. The Governor has put a lot of effort into the Alternative Routes program. PESB staff is trying to educate legislators on other strategies to prepare more math and science teachers.

Ms. Nishida spoke about a proposal from the State Board for Community and Technical Colleges. They are interested in proposing ways for community and technical colleges to add endorsements for existing teachers. They are interested in a pilot partnership that will take community and technical colleges partnering with higher education, 4-year preparation institutions to provide endorsements via the community college. Staff is looking for input on whether or not to pursue this pilot partnership program.

QUESTIONS ON PRESENTATION

Members expressed concern over taking on more projects at this time. Other members questioned the oversight of this project. Ms. Nishida clarified that the actual administration of the program would happen through the PESB and the partnership would be between the community and technical college and a 4-year preparation institution.

Members felt this is a great idea that could be tabled until a later time, after more information is gathered.

CHAIR CALLS FOR A MOTION

MOTION was made by Terry Bergeson and seconded to direct staff to continue to explore the issues entailed in the email from the State Board for Community and Technical Colleges, but make no commitment for the board at this time.

DISCUSSION ON MOTION

Dr. Bergeson spoke in favor of her motion.

VOTE 17 yes – 0 no

MOTION passed.

Dr. Bergeson provided commentary on the Governor's budget.

PRESENTATION: PROCESS FOR OUT-OF-STATE NON-STATE APPROVED TEACHER PREPARATION PROGRAMS' PLACEMENT OF STUDENT TEACHERS IN WASHINGTON SCHOOL DISTRICTS

- Dr. Lin Douglas, Interim Executive Director, PESB

Dr. Douglas provided a summary of the agenda item. During the last Executive Committee meeting, it was determined that this item should be shared with the full board to determine future action. WACTE raised concerns about out-of-state teacher preparation programs placing student teachers in Washington schools and members of the board representing higher education have also raised this as a concern.

The Executive Committee directed staff to propose a process by which out-of-state programs would need to apply for approval to place their student teachers in Washington schools. Dr. Douglas highlighted the features of this process and the sample application that would be used. Following discussion, the board was asked to provide direction for staff related to this issue.

The board directed staff to pursue this option and share the proposal with the personnel association, and other groups, for response, and bring it back at a future meeting.

CHAIR CALLS FOR A MOTION

MOTION was made by June Canty and seconded to adjourn meeting.

VOTE 18 yes - 0 no

MOTION passed.

Chair adjourned the meeting at 3:23 p.m.

Written update provided by Sheila Fox:

State Board of Education Actions, November 2006

Sheila Fox, SBE Liaison to the PESB

The items below have been selected from the State Board of Education's website (<http://www.sbe.wa.gov/>) because these actions have implications for the preparation of educators as well as for P-12 students. Editorial comments are noted in **italics**.

Meeting Highlights, November 29, 2006: **Certificate of Academic Achievement:** The Board voted to keep the math WASL requirement for graduating seniors. But for students in the Classes of 2008–10, the Board recommends an additional option. This option would allow students who have not met the standard to graduate if they successfully complete two additional high school mathematics classes. Those students must also continue to take the WASL until they pass or graduate.

This decision on a proposal to the Legislature is consistent with a recent proposal by Gov. Chris Gregoire and State Superintendent Terry Bergeson. The Board's support depends on adoption by the Legislature and funding of the Joint Math Action Plan to strengthen how math is taught and learned.

The Board also recommended that the Legislature create a fund to provide incentives for districts to show significant gains in math WASL scores over the next three years.

(Requiring students who have not passed the math WASL to successfully complete two additional math classes will require additional qualified math teachers. At the January SBE meeting, Board members will elaborate on the definition of what will be "high school mathematics.")

From this additional website page: <http://www.sbe.wa.gov/gradreq/caa/caaMath.htm>

The Board's support for this option depends on the adoption by the Legislature and funding of the Joint Mathematics Action Plan as the road map to strengthening the state's school system and dramatically improving mathematics achievement.

For the classes of 2011 and beyond, students must meet the current requirement of passing the 10th grade mathematics WASL to earn the Certificate of Academic Achievement.

The Board also recommends to the Legislature the creation of a funding pool to provide incentives to schools and/or school districts that make significant gains or demonstrate exemplary performance in closing the achievement gap on the mathematics WASL over the next three years.

Joint Mathematics Action Plan: *(What follows is a summary of items reviewed by PESB members in November.)*

The Board approved the Joint Math Action Plan which outlines steps necessary to bring Washington to the forefront of mathematics education and raise student achievement dramatically. The plan was developed cooperatively by the Office of Superintendent of Public Instruction (OSPI), the Professional Educator Standards Board (PESB), and the State Board of Education (SBE). The plan contains a common strategy and action to be taken by each agency.

Why are students not performing better in mathematics? The Action Plan identifies a number of system challenges:

- There are questions about the appropriateness of state standards.
- The current system lacks the ability to ensure students actually take the mathematics classes and curriculum that align to the Essential Academic Learning Requirements (EALRs) and the Grade Level Expectations (GLEs).
- There is a lack of highly-qualified mathematics teachers.
- The high school mathematics graduation requirement is "seat time" based whereas the WASL is competency based. In addition, the high school mathematics graduation requirement is not aligned with college entrance requirements.
- Teachers lack classroom assessments and intervention strategies to monitor and help individual student performance.
- The state lacks adequate management information to track effective practices within the K–12 system. There needs to be better data on teacher credentials, student course taking, and remedial interventions being provided.
- Community members have differing expectations about the kind of mathematics students need to learn.

In response to these system challenges, the SBE, OSPI and, PESB will move forward to do the following:

- Align standards, assessments, and curriculum
- Ensure quality teaching
- Revise graduation requirements
- Deliver efficient, effective, and equitable instruction and interventions
- Gather meaningful data on learning and effective teaching
- Engage parents and the public

Online Public Comment Form

Date: 1/17/2007

Response Requested: ☐ Yes ☒ No

Name: Frank Kline

Title / Occupation: President

Organization: Washington Association of Colleges of Teacher Education

Subject: Professional Certification and ESDs

Comments: I know that by the time you receive this comment you will have already completed action on the agenda item. Even so, there are two comments I'd like to make.

First of all, I want to extend thanks to the subcommittee who sought and accepted comments and ideas from WACTE members and other sources so graciously. The process seemed inclusive to me and I think that the various WACTE members felt heard.

Secondly, I want to suggest to you that now the rules are set to encourage ESD cooperation with institutions of higher education, that you establish the procedures and application forms in such a way that if an ESD decides they need to develop a Professional Certification program without a higher education partner, there will be some way for them to share how they have pursued cooperative agreements and explain their decision process.

Once again, thank you for the work you do. As board members, you all make significant commitments in travel, preparation, and meeting time. I appreciate the efforts you make.

Thank your for your comments.

Please email this form to pesb@k12.wa.us